

## REMARKS

Applicant has carefully studied the outstanding Office Action in the present application. The present response is intended to be fully responsive to all points of rejection raised by the Examiner and is believed to place the application in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and allowance of the application are respectfully requested.

The drawings are objected to as failing to comply with 37 CFR 1.84(p) because they include a reference sign not mentioned in the description. Applicant has amended the specification to include a reference to the reference sign. No new matter has been added.

Claims 21-23 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, for failing to comply with the enablement requirement. Applicant respectfully submits that support for claims 21-23 can be found in the specification in the paragraph bridging pages 15 and 16.

Claims 1-6 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102 (b) as being anticipated by Using Netscape™ 2 by Mark Brown. Claims 20-24 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Brown in view of Creemer (US 5,951,644).

Brown describes a method of selecting and registering with an Internet service provider. Creemer describes a system for managing network performance by managing and monitoring resource utilization.

Applicant has amended claim 1 to recite “and to disconnect said user from said user-selected Internet service provider upon receipt of a disconnect signal from said user”. Applicant has amended claim 6 to recite “subsequently disconnecting said user from said user-selected Internet service provider upon receipt of a disconnect signal from said user”. Brown does not show or suggest disconnecting the user from the user-selected Internet service provider upon receipt of a disconnect signal from the user, as recited in amended claims 1 and 6. While the user is implicitly disconnected from the Internet service provider in the method of Brown, the disconnect is not as a result of the configurator receiving a disconnect signal from the user. Support for the amendments to claims 1 and 6 can be found in the specification on page 12, lines 16-18.

Neither of the prior art references, Brown or Creemer, either alone or in combination, show or suggest disconnecting the user from the user-selected Internet service provider upon receipt of a disconnect signal from the user, as recited in amended claims 1 and 6. Claims 1 and 6 are therefore deemed to be allowable over the prior art. Claims 2-5 and 20-23 depend directly or ultimately from claim 1 and recite additional patentable matter and are therefore deemed allowable.

Applicant has added new claims 25-34 which recite additional features of the system and method of the present invention. Support for new claims 25-34 can be found in the specification on page 9, lines 9-17; page 12, lines 16-18 and on page 14, lines 28-31.

New claims 25-29 depend directly or ultimately from amended claim 1 and are therefore deemed allowable. New claims 30-34 depend directly or ultimately from amended claim 6 and are therefore deemed allowable.

Applicant reserves the right to pursue the claims as filed in the context of a continuation or divisional application.

In view of the foregoing, all of the claims are deemed to be allowable. Favorable reconsideration and allowance of the application are respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN

Date: 7/26/04

By:   
Eric S. Hyman, Reg. No. 30,139

12400 Wilshire Boulevard  
Seventh Floor  
Los Angeles, California 90025  
(310) 207-3800

**CERTIFICATE OF MAILING**

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail in an envelope addressed to:  
Commissioner for Patents, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on 7/26/04.

  
Kumiko Alexander

7/26/04  
Date